

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-5, 12-14, 16-18, 20, 22-26, and 31 are pending. Claims 3, 20, 25, and 31 have been amended and claims 2, 6-11, 15, 19, 21, 27-30, and 32 have been canceled.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 3-5, 12-14, 16-18, 20, 23-25, and 28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) based on a Kikuchi-Egan combination. Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

The Kikuchi publication discloses a method for tracing the activities of an Internet user, specifically in the context of using an e-mail service. However, the Kikuchi publication has nothing to do with a packet call. Rather, its disclosure is limited to users who access the internet through, for example, their home computers for sending and receiving e-mails.

The Egan patent discloses performing a tracing operation for a call transmitted over the internet from a mobile phone, e.g, a mobile VoIP call. In citing Egan, the Examiner has taken the position that it would have been obvious to use the e-mail tracing method of Kikuchi to trace and monitor packet calls as disclosed in Egan.

However, even if such a combination were permissibly formed, that combination would still not include all the features recited in claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites that if the target IP address is an active address, “determining if a packet call corresponding to the target IP address exists in a packet data protocol context database.” As is apparent from the specification and as those skilled in the art can appreciate, a PDP context database provides information relating to the virtual connection of packet calls that are currently connected to mobile network.

This information may including an access port number, a specific APN that represents a specific PDN, as well as other information relating to the origins and identity of the call/caller. This information may be used to trace and monitor the packet call that is suspected, for example, to be related to illegal activity.

In contrast, in the Kikuchi system, a user management table is consulted. (Paragraph [63]). This table stores ID information for Internet e-mail subscribers along with a monitoring parameter and flag indicating whether a packet is being monitored. (Paragraph [51]). This information does not, however, in any way relate to a packet call or any of the information found in a PDP context database that is used to connect a packet call.

Moreover, the Kikuchi publication discloses retrieving information from the user management table only after a user has logged off the Internet. (See Paragraph [63]). In contrast, claim 1 recites performing the determining step “if the target IP address is an active address,” i.e., that is while the call is still connected.

The Egan patent also fails to teach or suggest these features, i.e., even if the Egan system uses a PDP context database, it does not teach or suggest using that database conditionally in performing a packet call tracing or monitoring function.

In addition to these differences, claim 1 recites that if the target IP address does not exist in the packet data protocol (PDP) context database, setting a trigger flag for the target IP address. The Kikuchi and Egan patents fail to teach or suggest using a PDP context database in conditionally performing a packet call tracing or monitoring function. Thus, while the Kikuchi

publication discloses setting a trigger flag, it does not teach or suggest doing so based on searching a PDP context database in connection with a packet call as recited in claim 1. Rather, Kikuchi sets a trigger flag in its user management table 9 that relates to internet subscribers.

Claim 1 further recites “performing at least one of a tracing or monitoring operation for the packet call or target IP address based on the set trigger flag.” However, the Kikuchi system performs a monitoring function only if a flag is set. If the flag is not set, Kikuchi does nothing. (See Paragraphs [65] and [66] with reference to Figure 5). Also, claim 1 recites that if the target IP address does not exist in the packet data protocol (PDP) context database, setting a trigger flag for the target IP address. These features are also not taught or suggested by the Kikuchi publication, whether taken alone or in combination with Egan.

In view of the foregoing considerations, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Claim 18 recites a processing circuit which, if the target IP address is an active address, determines if a packet call corresponding to the target IP address exists in a packet data protocol context database, and if the target IP address does not exist in the packet data protocol (PDP) context database, sets a trigger flag for the target IP address and tracing or monitoring the packet call based on the set trigger flag. These features are not taught or suggested by the Kikuchi and Egan references, whether taken alone or in combination.

Claim 20 has been amended to recite the features of allowable claim 30 and its intervening claims. Applicants submit that these amendments are sufficient to place claim 20 and its dependent claims into condition for allowance.

Claim 24 recites “determining that the packet call having the target IP address does not exist in a packet data protocol context database, setting a trigger flag of the target IP address, and if the packet call having an IP address with the set trigger flag exists in the packet data protocol context database, starting the packet call tracing or monitoring of the target IP address.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Kikuchi and Egan references, whether taken alone or in combination


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/628,412
Amendment dated January 7, 2008
Reply to Office Action of August 6, 2007

Docket No. K-0525

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw
Date: January 7, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610